

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Advisory Action mailed November 22, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Present Status of Patent Application

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 4-9, and 12-18 are pending in the present application. More specifically, independent claims 1, 9, and 14 have been currently amended without introduction of new matter; and claims 2-3 and 10-11 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these claims in a continuing application if they choose to do so, and do not intend to dedicate the subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

A. Examiner interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner for the phone conversation Examiner had with Applicant's representative P.S. Dara on December 19. Based on the phone conversation, representative P. S. Dara facsimiled a set of amended claims to the Examiner on the same day. Subsequently, Examiner telephoned P. S. Dara on December 20 to suggest further amendments to the submitted claims and has indicated that he would favorably consider the claims if these additional amendments were to be introduced. Consequently, Applicant hereby submits amended claims that are in conformance with Examiner's suggestions and respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

B. Remarks in Advisory Action

Applicant wishes to traverse certain assertions made in the Advisory Action. Consequently, attention is drawn to the following portion of the Advisory action: *The applicant merely argues that in Juno et al, the RF circuit (128) is an antenna circuit which does not use a human hand in conjunction with two electrodes configured as a capacitive antenna; therefore, the hand detection circuit (126) does not detect a change in resonant frequency in the RF circuit (128). The examiner respectfully disagrees. In Junod et al, the RF circuit (128) is not disclosed as an antenna circuit or having antenna function. Junod et al discloses the RF circuit (128) as a transceiver for transmitting (driving) and receiving signals using two capacitive electrodes (122,*

124) as a capacitive antenna (see figure 7, and [044, 0047, 0048]. Namely, the two electrodes (122, 124) play antenna function, while the RF circuit (128) does not. (Emphasis added)

Applicant's response to remarks in the Advisory action

In light of the portion reproduced above, Applicant wishes to clarify certain remarks made by Applicant in the earlier response to the final Office action. Specifically, attention is drawn to the following statement in Applicant's earlier response: *Junod's figure 6 is a circuit diagram of a capacitive (hand) detection circuit, while figure 7 is a block diagram illustrating capacitive plates used for both antenna and hand detection functions. While the antenna function of fig. 7 (RF circuit 128) does indeed use a human hand in conjunction with two electrodes configured as a capacitive antenna...*

Arguably, it is possible that the second sentence reproduced above can be construed to imply that RF circuit 128 is an antenna circuit. However, Applicant wishes to clarify that this was not the intended meaning. In fact, Applicant is in complete agreement with the Office action, in that RF circuit 128 is indeed a transceiver which uses the two capacitive electrodes (122, 124) as a capacitive antenna. This is attested to, by Applicant's first sentence (reproduced above), which specifically states: "capacitive plates used for both antenna and hand detection functions."

However, the point that Applicant was trying to make appears to have been lost in interpretation. Consequently, Examiner is requested to consider the following remarks, which are being made so as to clarify the earlier remarks.

Junod's RF circuit 128 uses the two capacitive electrodes (122, 124) as a capacitive antenna, which does, presumably, lead to a change in resonant frequency of operation of RF circuit 128 (the transceiver) when a human hand is in the vicinity of the capacitive electrodes.

In addition to being used by RF circuit 128, the two capacitive electrodes (122, 124) are also used by hand detect circuit 126 (in certain cases independent of RF circuit 128 - see switch 130 of figure 7 and also paragraph [0045]). As far as hand detect circuit 126 is concerned, placing a hand on the capacitive electrodes causes a change in the charging/discharging time of a detection capacitance 50 (shown in figure 6, along with graphs in figures 3 and 4). This charging/discharging time phenomenon is used for hand detection (via comparator 58). Hand detection by circuit 126 is **not** carried out by detecting the change in resonant frequency that occurs in RF circuit 128.

In contrast, Applicant carries out hand detection (user proximity) by detecting a change in resonant frequency and not by capacitor charging/discharging time as is done by Junod.

Applicant has pointed out in his original specification, how certain shortcomings in prior art can be overcome by carrying out detection based on a change in resonant frequency; and has included this aspect in his original independent claims. For example, original independent claim 1 included: ...*is detected based on a said change in resonant frequency of said first circuit.*

Regardless of the clarification made above, Applicant has opted to currently amend independent claims 1, 9 and 14 to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims that Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The independent claims have been additionally amended to include certain suggestions made by Examiner during the Examiner interview. Applicant does not concede that these amendments are necessary for the originally presented claims to be allowed. However, Applicant chooses to do so in the interests of moving forward prosecution in this case. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims in their current form.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and pending claims 1, 4-9, and 12-18 are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative at (404) 610-5689.

Respectfully submitted,

/P. S. Dara/

Name: P. S. Dara

Reg. No. 52,793

I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents on the date shown below:

Date of transmission: 20 December 2006

Signature: /P. S. Dara/

P. S. Dara
7115 Threadstone Overlook
Duluth, GA 30097
(404)-610-5689